

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,830	09/23/2003	James L. Freeby	2032.2.1	4985
36491	7590 04/07/2004		EXAMINER	
KUNZLER & ASSOCIATES 8 EAST BROADWAY			KATCHEVES, BASIL S	
SALT LAKI	ECITY, UT 84111	^	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3635	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTOL-326 (Re		on Summary P	art of Paper No /Mail Date 040104			
2) Notice 3) Inform Paper U.S. Patent and Tree	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (I Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	PTO-413) e tent Application (PTO-152)			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
9) <u></u> 10) <u></u>	The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the disceplacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	pted or b) objected to by the E rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	ion Papers	ciection requirement.				
	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement	-			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 September 2003</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
Status						
- External e	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing need patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	e6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from source the application to be seen APANCONE.	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply					
	The MAII ING DATE of this communication and	Basil Katcheves	3635			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		10/668,830	FREEBY ET AL.			
3		Application No.	Applicant(s)			

Art Unit: 3635

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 12-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,946,569 to Stuber.

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Stuber discloses a barrier (fig. 7: 24) comprised of a bentonite material surrounding a pole (fig. 7: 10).

Regarding claim 2, Stuber discloses a retaining device (fig. 7: 20) for retaining the material.

Regarding claim 3, Stuber discloses a pole (fig. 7: 10).

Regarding claims 4 and 16, Stuber discloses the material as surrounding the pole (fig. 7).

Regarding claims 12 and 14, Stuber discloses a depression (fig. 8: 16) at the boundary of the material.

Art Unit: 3635

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-10, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,946,569 to Stuber.

Regarding claims 5-7, Stuber discloses the basic claim structure of the instant application but does not disclose specific dimensions between the perimeter and the pole. Applicant fails to show criticality for specifically claimed dimensions, therefore it would have been an obvious design choice to use the dimensions such as specified in these claims.

Regarding claims 8-10, Stuber discloses the basic claim structure of the instant application but does not disclose specific dimensions of the material depth. Applicant fails to show criticality for specifically claimed dimensions, therefore it would have been an obvious design choice to use the dimensions such as specified in these claims.

Regarding claim 17, Stuber does not specifically disclose the bentonite as sloping upwards toward the pole. However, Stuber discloses mixing the bentonite with concrete (column 3, lines 37-42). A centrally sloping slurry, toward the central pole, would be inherent, as gravity acts upon a slurry to provide an upward sloping toward the slurry's center as it is poured.

Art Unit: 3635

Regarding claim 19, Stuber does not disclose shoveling the bentonite material into the hole with the pole. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to shovel the bentonite, as bantonite is a concrete like slurry and shoveling is a common means of applying and smoothing concrete type slurrys therefore reducing costs.

Claims 11, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,946,569 to Stuber in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,048,605 to Toon et al.

Regarding claims 11 and 15, Stuber discloses the bentonite material in an annular ring around the pole (fig. 7: 12) wrapped by a rubber sheet, not a plastic sheet. Toon discloses a pole surrounded by bentonite (column 1, line 29) having a plastic sheet wrapped around (column 5, lines 62-66). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stuber by using a plastic sheet, as disclosed by Toon, in order to increase the barrier protection while reducing costs.

Regarding claim 20, Stuber discloses bentonite material in an annular ring around a pole (fig. 7: 12) wrapped by a rubber sheet, not a plastic sheet. Toon discloses a pole surrounded by bentonite (column 1, line 29) having a plastic sheet wrapped around (column 5, lines 62-66). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stuber by using a

Art Unit: 3635

plastic sheet, as disclosed by Toon, in order to increase the barrier protection while reducing costs. Also, Stuber in view of Toon discloses the basic claim structure of the instant application but does not disclose specific dimensions of the bentonite material. Applicant fails to show criticality for specifically claimed dimensions, therefore it would have been an obvious design choice to use the dimensions such as specified in these claims.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,946,569 to Stuber in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,399,544 to Fairchild et al.

Regarding claim 18, Stuber does not specifically disclose pumping of the material. Fairchild discloses the pumping of a bentonite material (abstract, line 1).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stuber by using a pumpable bentonite material, as disclosed by Fairchild, in order to speed installation time.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The cited patents listed on the included form PTO-892 further show the state of the art with respect to bentonite pole protection in general.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Basil Katcheves whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 3635

Page 6

(703) 306-0232. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman, can be reached at (703) 308-0832.

4/1/04

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Group 3600